

**Remarks/Arguments**

**35 USC 103**

Claims 1-18 have been rejected under 35USC103 as unpatentable over US 5,689,563 to Brown et al in view of US 6,879,690 to Faccin et al. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this rejection for the following reasons:

The instant invention relates to a method for interworking a wireless local area network (WLAN) with a second network through a broker, a system for interworking a wireless local area network (WLAN) with a second network through a broker, and a mobile device which receives from a second network a broker certificate which allows communication with a first network. Nowhere does either of the cited references affect the patentability of the claimed invention.

Brown et al relate to an authentication arrangement for a cellular system. Nowhere do Brown et al show or suggest:

“a method for interworking between the wireless local area network and a second network, the wireless local area network and the second network capable of communicating with a broker”,

as specifically recited in Claim 1. Nowhere do Brown et al show or suggest a WLAN, nor any interworking between a WLAN and a second network, nor any broker. The Applicant has carefully reviewed the portions of Brown et al which have been relied upon by the Examiner, but is unable to agree with the Examiner's analysis.

Faccin et al relates to a cellular arrangement where a mobile terminal roams between cellular systems. Nowhere do Faccin et al show or suggest

any broker. Rather, Faccin et al delegates security procedures to the second domain. See column 3, lines 1-2. It is therefore clear that even if the methods of Brown et al were to be combined with the methods of Faccin et al, the patentability of Claim 1 would not be affected.

Similarly, nowhere do either of Brown et al or Faccin et al show or suggest:

“a method for interworking between the wireless local area network and a second network, the wireless local area network and the second network capable of communicating with a broker”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 5. It is therefore clear that even if the methods of Brown et al were to be combined with the methods of Faccin et al, the patentability of Claim 5 would not be affected.

Similarly, nowhere do either of Brown et al or Faccin et al show or suggest:

“the second network having an interworking contract with the wireless local area network, the wireless local area network and the second network capable of communicating with a broker”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 10. It is therefore clear that even if the methods of Brown et al were to be combined with the methods of Faccin et al, the patentability of Claim 10 would not be affected.

Similarly, nowhere do either of Brown et al or Faccin et al show or suggest:

“A broker-based system for authenticating users and networks having interworking relationships, comprising:

a wireless local area network having an interworking function;

a second network; and  
a broker capable of communicating with the wireless local area network and the second network”,

as specifically recited in Claim 14. It is therefore clear that even if the methods of Brown et al were to be combined with the methods of Faccin et al, the patentability of Claim 14 would not be affected.

Similarly, nowhere do either of Brown et al or Faccin et al show or suggest:

“means for receiving from a second network a second network user certificate that includes a broker to second network certificate and a key;  
means for transmitting said second network to user certificate to a first network”,

as specifically recited in Claim 16. It is therefore clear that even if the structure of Brown et al were to be combined with the structure of Faccin et al, the patentability of Claim 16 would not be affected.

Claim 2-4 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Similarly, Claims 6-9 are dependent from Claim 5 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 5.

Similarly, Claims 11-13 are dependent from Claim 10 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 10.

Similarly, claim 15 is dependent from claim 14 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that this subclaim is patentable as its parent Claim 14.

Similarly, Claims 17 and 18 are dependent from Claim 16 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 16.

The Applicant believes that, except for the fee for the extension, no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to Applicant's Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

The Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JUNBIAO ZHANG

by: \_\_\_/Daniel E. Sragow/\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel E. Sragow, Attorney  
Reg. No. 22,856  
(609)-734-6832

DES:kl

Thomson Licensing LLC  
Patent Operations  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
Date: 30 September 2009